



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Architecture Reconstruction Guidelines, 2nd Edition


Rick Kazman
Liam O'Brien
Chris Verhoef

December 2002

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20030321 032

TECHNICAL REPORT
CMU/SEI-2002-TR-034
ESC-TR-2002-034





CarnegieMellon
Software Engineering Institute
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890

Architecture Reconstruction Guidelines, 2nd Edition

CMU/SEI-2002-TR-034
ESC-TR-2002-034

Rick Kazman
Liam O'Brien
Chris Verhoef

December 2002

Architecture Tradeoff Analysis Initiative

Unlimited distribution subject to the copyright.

This report was prepared for the

SEI Joint Program Office
HQ ESC/DIB
5 Eglin Street
Hanscom AFB, MA 01731-2116

The ideas and findings in this report should not be construed as an official DoD position. It is published in the interest of scientific and technical information exchange.

FOR THE COMMANDER



Christos Scondras
Chief of Programs, XPK

This work is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Defense. The Software Engineering Institute is a federally funded research and development center sponsored by the U.S. Department of Defense.

Copyright 2002 by Carnegie Mellon University.

NO WARRANTY

THIS CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY AND SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE MATERIAL IS FURNISHED ON AN "AS-IS" BASIS. CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY MAKES NO WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, AS TO ANY MATTER INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, WARRANTY OF FITNESS FOR PURPOSE OR MERCHANTABILITY, EXCLUSIVITY, OR RESULTS OBTAINED FROM USE OF THE MATERIAL. CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY DOES NOT MAKE ANY WARRANTY OF ANY KIND WITH RESPECT TO FREEDOM FROM PATENT, TRADEMARK, OR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT.

Use of any trademarks in this report is not intended in any way to infringe on the rights of the trademark holder.

Internal use. Permission to reproduce this document and to prepare derivative works from this document for internal use is granted, provided the copyright and "No Warranty" statements are included with all reproductions and derivative works.

External use. Requests for permission to reproduce this document or prepare derivative works of this document for external and commercial use should be addressed to the SEI Licensing Agent.

This work was created in the performance of Federal Government Contract Number F19628-00-C-0003 with Carnegie Mellon University for the operation of the Software Engineering Institute, a federally funded research and development center. The Government of the United States has a royalty-free government-purpose license to use, duplicate, or disclose the work, in whole or in part and in any manner, and to have or permit others to do so, for government purposes pursuant to the copyright license under the clause at 252.227-7013.

Table of Contents

Abstract	vii
1 Introduction	1
2 Architecture Reconstruction	3
2.1 Recommendations for Reconstruction Projects	5
3 Information Extraction Phase	7
3.1 Guidelines	9
4 Database Construction Phase	11
4.1 Guidelines	13
5 View Fusion Phase	15
5.1 Improving a View	15
5.2 Disambiguating Function Calls	17
5.3 Guidelines	17
6 Architecture Reconstruction Phase	19
6.1 Guidelines	23
7 Other Architecture Reconstruction Approaches	25
7.1 Bowman and Associates	25
7.2 Harris and Associates	25
7.3 Guo and Associates	26
8 Summary	27
References	29

List of Figures

Figure 1: Outline of the Dali Workbench and Its Phases	5
Figure 2: Conversion of the Extracted View to SQL Format	11
Figure 3: Example of SQL Code Generated in Dali	12
Figure 4: Static and Dynamic Data Views	15
Figure 5: The Differences Between Static and Dynamic Views	16
Figure 6: Items That Were Added to and Omitted from the Overall View	17
Figure 7: An Architectural View Represented at the Highest Hierarchical Level	19
Figure 8: Subset of the Elements and Relations	20
Figure 9: Graphical Representation of Elements and Relations	21
Figure 10: Patterns to Aggregate Local Variables to the Function in Which They Are Defined	21
Figure 11: Result of Applying the Pattern to Aggregate Local Variables	22
Figure 12: Query to Identify the Logical_Interaction Component	23
Figure 13: Example of a Bad Pattern	24

List of Tables

Table 1:	A Typical Set of Source Elements and Relations	7
Table 2:	Guiding Principles for Choosing Types of Extraction	10

Abstract

Architecture reconstruction is the process of obtaining the “as-built” architecture of an implemented system from the existing legacy system. For this process, tools are used to extract information about the system that will assist in building successive levels of abstraction. Although generating a useful representation is not always possible, a successful reconstruction results in an architectural representation that aids in reasoning about the system. This recovered representation is most often used as a basis for redocumenting the architecture of an existing system if the documentation is out of date or nonexistent, and can be used to check the “as-built” architecture against the “as-designed” architecture. The architectural representation can also be used as a starting point for reengineering the system to a new desired architecture. Finally, the representation can be used to help identify components for reuse or to help establish a software product line.

This report describes the process of architecture reconstruction using the Dali architecture reconstruction workbench. Guidelines are presented for reconstructing the architectural representations of existing systems. Most of these guidelines are not specific to the Dali tool, can be used with other tools, and are useful even if the architecture reconstruction is carried out manually.

1 Introduction

Architecture reconstruction is the process where the “as-built” architecture of an implemented system is obtained from an existing legacy system. This is done through a detailed system analysis using tool support. The tools extract information about the system and aid in building successive levels of abstraction. If the reconstruction is successful, the end result is an architectural representation that aids in reasoning about the system. In some cases, however, generating a useful representation is not possible due to the complexity and the lack of structure of the system involved.

This is the *second* edition of this technical report, which was originally published in 2001. In this edition, a new Section 2 provides more details about architecture reconstruction, and Section 2.1 has been added to provide recommendations for reconstruction projects. Also in this edition, the name of the first phase of the reconstruction process has been changed to “Information Extraction” from “View Extraction” to more accurately describe what happens in the phase and to make clearer the distinction between this phase and phase 4, where architectural views are generated.

2 Architecture Reconstruction

Architecture reconstruction generates an architectural representation that can be used in several ways. The main use for this representation is to document the existing architecture of a system. If no documentation exists or the available documentation is out of date, the recovered architectural representation can be used as a basis for redocumenting the architecture. Reconstruction can be performed either during the development of an architecture or after the development has been completed to recover the “as-built” architecture of the system to check conformance against the “as-designed” architecture. The architectural representation can also be used as a starting point for reengineering the system to a new desired architecture. Finally, the representation can be used as a means for identifying components for reuse or for establishing an architecture-based software product line.

Architecture reconstruction has been used in a variety of projects ranging from Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) scanners to public telephone switches, and from helicopter guidance systems to classified National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) systems. The Software Engineering Institute (SEISM) has used architecture reconstruction to

- redocument architectures for physics simulations
- understand architectural dependencies in embedded control software for reengineering
- evaluate the conformance of a satellite ground station system’s implementation to its reference architecture
- reconstruct three embedded automotive systems and evaluate their potential for conversion to a product line
- recover the architecture of several network management systems
- recover the architecture of a satellite simulation system

Other organizations have used the SEI’s architecture reconstruction methods as well. A technical note by Liam O’Brien provides details about various projects undertaken at Nokia, some of them using the SEI’s methods [O’Brien 02].

Architecture reconstruction requires a range of activities and skills. Software engineers familiar with compiler construction techniques and UNIX environments (especially utilities such as grep, sed, awk, perl, python, and lex/yacc) have the necessary skills to undertake architecture reconstruction. However, with the large amount of software in most systems, it is impossible to perform all architecture reconstruction activities manually.

SM SEI is a service mark of Carnegie Mellon University.

Tool support is needed for these activities, and in general, no single tool or set of tools is adequate. Software systems are often implemented in many languages and dialects. For example, a mature MRI scanner easily contains software written in 15 different languages. Because of this diversity, there is no complete, universally applicable tool set that can operate with the push of a button. Instead, a tool set (workbench) is needed to support architecture reconstruction activities.

An architecture reconstruction workbench should be open (i.e., easily accommodate new tools as required) and provide a lightweight integration framework so that new tools added to the set do not impact the existing tools or data unnecessarily. The SEI has developed a workbench of this type called Dali [Kazman 99]. Other examples include Sneed's reengineering workbench [Sneed 98], the software renovation factories of Verhoef and associates [Brand 97], and the rearchitecting tool suite by Philips Research [Krikhaar 99].

Using the tool support provided by the Dali workbench, the software architecture reconstruction process comprises the following five phases:

1. Information Extraction

In the Information Extraction phase, information is obtained from various sources.

2. Database Construction

The Database Construction phase involves converting the extracted information into the Rigi Standard Form [Müller 93] (a tuple-based data format in the form of "relation <entity1> <entity2>") and an SQL database format from which the database is created.

3. View Fusion

The View Fusion phase combines information stored in the database to generate a set of low-level views.

4. Architecture Reconstruction

In the Architecture Reconstruction phase, the main work of building abstractions and representations, and generating an architectural representation takes place.

5. Architecture Analysis

The Architecture Analysis phase involves analyzing the resulting architecture. Architecture analysis is not addressed in this report, but is the topic of *ATAM: Method for Architecture Evaluation* [Kazman 00]. Current and complete details about architecture analysis can be found in the book *Evaluating Software Architectures: Methods and Case Studies* [Clements 02].

All five phases are highly iterative. Figure 1 depicts the structure of the Dali workbench and situates the tasks of architecture reconstruction within it.




Figure 1: Outline of the Dali Workbench and Its Phases

Several people are needed to carry out the reconstruction process, including the person doing the reconstruction (the reconstructor) and one or more people who are familiar with the system being reconstructed (e.g., architects or software engineers).

The reconstructor extracts the information from the system and, either manually or using tools, generates views of the architecture. The reconstructor begins by generating a set of hypotheses about the system. These hypotheses reflect the set of inverse mappings from the set of source artifacts to the design (ideally the opposite of the design mappings). The hypotheses are then tested by generating and applying these inverse mappings to the extracted information and validating the results. In order to generate these hypotheses and validate them, the reconstructor needs the support of people who are familiar with the system, including the system architect or engineers who initially developed or currently maintain the system.

2.1 Recommendations for Reconstruction Projects

The following are general recommendations for reconstruction projects:

- Have a goal and a set of objectives or questions in mind before undertaking an architecture reconstruction project. For example, reusing part of the system in a new application may be a goal. Without these goals and objectives, a lot of effort could be spent on extracting information and generating architectural views that may not be helpful or serve any purpose.
- Obtain a high-level architectural view of the system before beginning the detailed reconstruction process. This view guides the

- extraction process by helping to identify the information that needs to be extracted from the system
 - reconstruction process by helping to determine what to look for in the architecture and what views to generate
- Use the existing documentation to generate only high-level views of the system. In many cases, the existing documentation for a system may not accurately reflect the system as it is implemented, but it should still give an indication of the high-level concepts.
- Involve the people who are familiar with the system early in the project to get a better understanding of the system being reconstructed. Tools can support the reconstruction effort and shorten the reconstruction process, but they cannot perform an entire reconstruction automatically. Architecture reconstruction requires the involvement of people (e.g., architects, maintainers, and developers) who are familiar with the system.
- Assign someone to work on the architecture reconstruction project full-time. Architecture reconstruction involves an extensive, detailed analysis of a system and requires significant effort.

The following sections describe the architecture reconstruction process in more detail and present guidelines that can be used to carry out each phase. Most of these guidelines are not specific to the Dali tool, can be used with other tools, and are useful even if the architecture reconstruction is carried out manually.

3 Information Extraction Phase

The Information Extraction phase involves analyzing the existing design and implementation artifacts of a system to construct a model based upon multiple source views. From the source artifacts (e.g., code, header files, build files) and other artifacts (e.g., execution traces) of the system, the elements of interest and the relations between them can be identified and captured to produce several fundamental views of the system. Table 1 shows a list of typical elements and several relations between elements that might be extracted from a system.

Table 1: A Typical Set of Source Elements and Relations

Source Element	Relation	Target Element	Description
File	includes	File	C preprocessor #include of one file by another
File	contains	Function	definition of a function in a file
File	defines_var	Variable	definition of a variable in a file
Function	calls	Function	static function call
Function	access_read	Variable	Read access on a variable
Function	access_write	Variable	Write access on a variable

Each of the relations between the elements constitutes a different view of the system. The “calls” relation between the functions yields the call graph of the system, showing how the various functions in the system interact. The “includes” relation between files shows the dependence view between files in the system. The “access_read” and “access_write” relations between functions and variables show how data is used in the system. Certain functions may write a set of data and others may read it. This relation information is used to determine how data is passed between various parts of the system. For example, it can determine whether a global data store is used (similar to a blackboard architectural style) or whether most information is passed through function calls.

If the system being analyzed is large and divided into a particular directory structure on a file system, capturing that directory structure may be important to the reconstruction process. Certain components or subsystems may be stored in particular directories, and capturing relations such as “dir_contains_file” and “dir_contains_dir” can help to identify components later in the reconstruction process.

The set of elements and relations extracted will depend on the type of system being analyzed and the extraction support tools available. If the system to be reconstructed is object oriented, classes and methods would be added to the list of elements to be extracted, and relations such as "Class is_subclass Class" and "Class contains Method" could be extracted and used in the reconstruction process.

Extracted views can be categorized as either static or dynamic. Static views are those obtained by observing only the artifacts of the system, while dynamic views are those obtained by observing the system during execution. In many cases, static and dynamic views can be fused to create a more complete and accurate representation of the system. (This fusing is discussed in Section 5.) If the architecture of the system changes at runtime, for example, a configuration file is read in by the system, and certain components are loaded at runtime. The runtime configuration should be captured and used when carrying out the reconstruction.

A source view can be extracted by applying whatever tools are available, appropriate, or necessary for a given target system. The types of tools that we have used regularly in our extractions include the following:

- parsers (e.g., Imagix, SNIFF+, C++ Information Abstractor [CIA], rigiparse)
- abstract syntax tree (AST)-based analyzers (e.g., Gen++, Refine)
- lexical analyzers (e.g., Lightweight Source Model Extractor [LSME])
- profilers (e.g., gprof)
- code instrumentation
- ad hoc (e.g., grep, perl)

These tools are applied to the raw source code. Parsers analyze the code and generate internal representations from it (for the purpose of generating machine code). Typically, it is possible to save this internal representation to obtain a source view. AST-based analyzers do a similar job, but they build an explicit tree representation of the parsed information. Analysis tools can be built that traverse the AST and output selected pieces of architecturally relevant information in an appropriate format.

Lexical analyzers examine source artifacts purely as strings of lexical elements or tokens. The user of a lexical analyzer can specify a set of lexical patterns to be matched and the elements to be output. An example of a lexical pattern would be one that recognizes the `#include <filename>` directive in source files, and the output elements would be the source file in which the `#include` appeared and the file within the angle brackets (`<>`). Finding and extracting instances of this lexical pattern yields the dependencies that exist between files.

Similarly, we have used a collection of ad hoc tools such as `grep` and `perl` to carry out lexical pattern matching and searching within the code in order to output some required information.

All of these tools—code-generating parsers, AST-based analyzers, lexical analyzers, and ad hoc lexical pattern matchers—are used to output purely static information.

Profilers and code coverage analysis tools can be used to output information about the code as it is being executed. Using them does not usually require the addition of any new code to the system. On the other hand, code instrumentation—which has wide applicability in the field of testing—involves adding code to the system to make it output some specific information (e.g., what processes connect with each other at runtime) while the system is executing [McCabe 00]. All of these tools and techniques generate dynamic views of the system.

Tools to analyze design models, build files, makefiles, and executables can also be used to extract further information as required. For instance, build files and makefiles include information on module or file dependencies that may not be reflected in the source code.

Much architecture-related information can be extracted *statically* from source code, compile-time artifacts, and design artifacts. However, this may not produce enough information for the architecture recovery process. Some architecturally relevant information may not exist in the source artifacts, due to late binding. Examples of late binding include

- polymorphism
- function pointers
- runtime parameterization

There are other reasons why the precise topology of a system might not be determined until runtime. For example, multiprocess and multiprocessor systems, using middleware such as Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA), Jini, or Component Object Model (COM), frequently establish their topology dynamically, depending on the availability of system resources. The topology of such systems does not reside in their source artifacts and hence cannot be reverse engineered using static extraction tools.

Therefore, it might be necessary to use tools that can generate dynamic information about the system (e.g., profiling tools). In some instances, this might not be possible because tools that can obtain this dynamic information are not available on the system platform. Also, there might be no way to collect the results from code instrumentation. This problem usually occurs with embedded systems, where there is no means to output the information generated from code instrumentation.

3.1 Guidelines

The following guidelines apply to the Information Extraction phase:

- Use the “least effort” extraction. Consider the kind of information that needs to be extracted from a source corpus and choose the most appropriate tool. Is the information lexical in nature? Does it require the comprehension of complex syntactic structures?

Does it require some semantic analysis? In each of these cases, a different tool could be applied successfully. In general, lexical approaches are the cheapest to use, and they should be considered if reconstruction goals are simple.

Table 2: *Guiding Principles for Choosing Types of Extraction*

Guiding Principles	Type of Extraction Required
The information that is to be extracted is lexical in nature. A set of lexical patterns can be written that allows the information to be extracted.	Lexical analysis. (Simple lexical analysis utilities such as perl and grep may be of use.)
The information that needs to be extracted cannot be identified lexically. Elements and relations can be identified through the use of a grammar for a language.	Parsing
More contextual information (semantic information) must be available to clearly identify certain elements and relations.	AST-based analyzers. (These allow an AST to be built and updated after parsing with semantic information.)

- Validate the source information that is extracted. Before starting to fuse or manipulate the various views that have been obtained, make sure that the correct information has been captured in the view. Also make sure that the tools being used to analyze the source artifacts are carrying out their job correctly. A detailed manual examination and verification of a subset with the elements and relations against the underlying source code should be carried out to establish that the correct information is being captured. The precise amount of information that needs to be verified manually is up to the individual. Assuming that this is a process of statistical sampling, the reconstructor can choose a desired confidence level. In general, the more information that is validated manually, the higher the confidence in the results.
- Extract dynamic information where required. If a lot of runtime or late binding occurs and the architecture is dynamically configurable, dynamic information about system runtime is essential and should be extracted using whatever technique is most appropriate. If a profiler is available, use it to extract runtime information. If the system runs on a platform where no profiler is available, it might be necessary to instrument the code to obtain the runtime information. When dynamic information cannot be extracted, only static information will be available for architectural representations.

4 Database Construction Phase

The set of extracted views are converted into the Dali format and stored in a relational database during the Database Construction phase. Several tools and techniques have been incorporated into the Dali workbench to assist with this process. They consist mainly of perl scripts that read the data and convert it into a file in the Rigi Standard Format. The extracted views may be in many different formats depending on the tools used to extract them. For example, an extraction tool like Imagix-4D can be used to load the source code of a system into its internal representation, and this information is then dumped to a set of flat files indexed by file or function. These files have a uniform structure, and tools can be developed in perl to read these files and output information about elements and relations.

Once the elements and relations file (Extracted View) is converted to Rigi Standard Format, it is read by another perl script. The data is output in a format that includes the necessary SQL code to build and populate the relational tables with the extracted information. Figure 2 depicts this process.



Figure 2: Conversion of the Extracted View to SQL Format

Figure 3 shows a typical example of the SQL code that is generated.

```
create table calls( caller text, callee text );
create table accesses( func text, variable text );
create table defines_var( file text, variable text );
...
insert into calls values( 'main', 'control' );
insert into calls values( 'main', 'clock' );
...
insert into accesses values( 'main', 'stat1' );
...
```

Figure 3: Example of SQL Code Generated in Dali

Dali currently uses the PostgreSQL relational database.¹ When the data is entered into the database, two additional tables are generated: components and relationships. The components table lists the set of source and target elements that has been extracted from the system, and the relationships table lists the set of relations that has been extracted from the system.

In addition to those currently available in Dali, new tools and techniques can be created to convert the format or formats an extraction tool uses. For example, if a tool is required to convert the output from a tool not currently supported, it can be built. Then the output from the new tool can be converted into Rigi Standard Format and converted to SQL code. The conversion tool used can become part of the Dali workbench.

In the current version of the Dali workbench, the PostgreSQL relational database provides functionality through the use of SQL and perl for generating and manipulating the architectural views [Stonebraker 90]. (Examples are shown in Section 4.) Changes could easily be made to the SQL scripts to make them compatible with other SQL implementations.

¹ For information on this database, go to <<http://www.postgresql.org>>.

4.1 Guidelines

The following guidelines apply to the Database Construction phase:

- Build database tables from the extracted relations to make processing the data views easier. For example, create a table that stores the results of a particular query, such as grouping the files into components or subsystems so the query will not need to be run again. If the results of that query are required for building further queries, they can be accessed through the table easily.
- As with any database construction, consider carefully the database design before getting started. What will the primary (and possibly secondary) key be? Will any database joins be particularly expensive because they span multiple tables?
- Use perl, awk, and similar lexical tools to change the format of data extracted using various tools into the Rigi Standard Format so that the Dali workbench can use the data. These tools are less expensive in terms of development time and resource utilization than writing more complex tools using other languages.

5 View Fusion Phase

In the View Fusion phase, a set of queries is defined that manipulates the extracted views to create fused views. For example, a static call view might be fused with a dynamic call view. As noted earlier, a static view might not provide all of the architecturally relevant information. In the case of late binding in the system, some function calls might not be identifiable until runtime, so a dynamic call view needs to be generated. These two views need to be reconciled and fused to produce the complete call graph for the system.

The View Fusion phase reconciles and establishes connections between views that provide complimentary information. Fusion is illustrated using the examples in Sections 5.1 and 5.2. The first shows the improvement of a static view of an object-oriented system with the addition of dynamic information. The other shows the fusion of several views to identify function calls in a system.

5.1 Improving a View

Consider the two code views shown in Figure 4: Static and Dynamic Data Views, which were from the sets of methods extracted from a system implemented in C++.

Static Extraction	Dynamic Extraction
<pre>InputValue::GetValue InputValue::SetValue List::[] List::length List::attachr List::detachr PrimitiveOp::Compute</pre>	<pre>InputValue::GetValue InputValue::SetValue InputValue::~InputValue InputValue::InputValue List::[] List::length List::getnth List::List List::~List ArithmeticOp::Compute AttachOp::Compute . . . StringOp::Compute</pre>

Figure 4: Static and Dynamic Data Views

The differences between these views are shaded in Figure 5.

Static Extraction

```
InputValue::GetValue  
InputValue::SetValue  
List::[]  
List::length  
List::attachr  
List::detachr  
PrimitiveOp::Compute
```

Dynamic Extraction

```
InputValue::GetValue  
InputValue::SetValue  
InputValue::~InputValue  
InputValue::InputValue  
List::[]  
List::length  
List::getnth  
List::List  
List::~List  
ArithmeticOp::Compute  
AttachOp::Compute  
StringOp::Compute
```

Figure 5: The Differences Between Static and Dynamic Views

The dynamic view shows that `List::getnth` is called. However, this method is not included in the static analysis view because it was not identified by the static extraction tool. That shows that the extraction tool is not perfect, making it necessary to validate the results of the information extraction. Also, the calls to the constructor and destructor methods of `InputValue` and `List` are not included in the static view. These missing methods must be added to the overall reconciled architectural view.

In addition, the static extraction shows that the `PrimitiveOp` class has a method called `Compute`. The dynamic extraction results show no such class, but do show classes such as `ArithmeticOp`, `AttachOp`, and `StringOp`, each of which has a `Compute` method and is in fact a subclass of `PrimitiveOp`. `PrimitiveOp` is purely a superclass; it is never actually called in an executing program. But it is the call to `PrimitiveOp` that a static extractor sees when scanning the source code, since the polymorphic call to one of `PrimitiveOp`'s subclasses occurs at runtime. To get an accurate view of the architecture, the static and dynamic views of `PrimitiveOp` must be reconciled. To do this, a fusion is performed using SQL queries over the extracted "calls", "actually_calls", and "has_subclass" relations. In this way, we can see that the calls to `PrimitiveOp::Compute` in the static view and to its various subclasses in the dynamic view are really the same thing.

The lists in Figure 6 show the items that would be added to the fused view (in addition to the methods that the static and dynamic views agreed upon) and those that are removed from the fused view (even though one of the static or dynamic views included them).

Added to Fused View

```
InputValue::InputValue  
InputValue::~~InputValue  
List::List  
List::~~List  
List::getnth
```

Not Added

```
ArithmeticOp::Compute  
AttachOp::Compute  
.  
StringOp::Compute
```

Figure 6: Items That Were Added to and Omitted from the Overall View

5.2 Disambiguating Function Calls

In a multiprocess application, name clashes are likely to occur. For example, several of the processes might have a procedure called `main`. It is important to identify and disambiguate these name clashes within the extracted views. Once again, by fusing information that can be extracted easily, we can remove this potential ambiguity. In this case, we would need to fuse the static calls view with a file/function containment view (to determine which functions are defined in which source files) and a build dependency view (to determine which files are compiled together to produce which executables). The fusion of these three information sources makes procedure or method names unique, allowing them to be referred to unambiguously in the architecture reconstruction process. Without the view fusion, name clashes would persist, and the reconstruction results would be ambiguous.

5.3 Guidelines

The following guidelines apply to the View Fusion phase:

- Fuse views when no single view provides the information needed for architecture reconstruction. For example, the calls view needs to show the functional decomposition of the system. If a static calls view and a dynamic calls view are present, they are fused to produce a single calls view that shows the decomposition.
- Fuse views when there is ambiguity within a view and a single view does not provide clear information.
- Consider using different extraction techniques to extract different view information. For example, both dynamic and static extraction techniques are available. Different instances of the same kind of technique can be used if a single instance might provide erroneous or incomplete information. For example, use different parsers for the same language if each provides different information.

6 Architecture Reconstruction Phase

The Architecture Reconstruction phase consists of two primary activity areas:

- visualization and interaction
- pattern definition and recognition.

The visualization and interaction area provides a mechanism that allows the user to visualize, explore, and manipulate views interactively. Rigi is used to present views to the user as a hierarchically decomposed graph [Wong 94]. An example presentation of an architectural view is shown in Figure 7.




Figure 7: An Architectural View Represented at the Highest Hierarchical Level

The pattern definition and recognition area provides facilities for architectural reconstruction. Dali's architecture reconstruction facilities allow a user to construct more abstract views from more detailed ones by identifying aggregations of elements. Patterns are defined in Dali using a combination of SQL and perl expressions. An SQL query is used to identify elements from the Dali repository that will contribute to a new aggregation, and perl expressions are used to transform names and perform other manipulations on the results of the query. Patterns are captured in a patterns file, and users can selectively apply and reuse various patterns.

Architecture reconstruction is not a straightforward process. Architectural constructs are not represented explicitly in the source code, making reconstruction especially difficult. Additionally, architectural constructs are realized by many diverse mechanisms in an implementation. Usually these are a collection of functions, classes, files, objects, and so forth. When a system is initially developed, its high-level design/architectural elements are mapped to implementation elements. Therefore, when architectural elements are "reconstructed," the inverse of the mappings needs to be applied.

Architecture reconstruction is an interpretive, interactive, and iterative process, not an automatic process. It requires the skills and attention of both the reverse engineering expert and the architect (or someone who has substantial knowledge of the architecture). Based upon the architectural patterns that the architecture expert expects to find in the system, the reverse engineer can build various queries using the Dali tool. These queries result in new aggregations that show various abstractions or clusterings of the lower level elements (which may be source artifacts or abstractions). By interpreting these views and actively analyzing them, it is possible to refine the queries and aggregations to produce several hypothesized architectural views of the system. These views can be interpreted, further refined, or rejected. There are no universal completion criteria for this process; it is complete when the architectural representation is sufficient to support the analysis needs of Dali users so the goals of the reconstruction can be achieved.

Consider the subset of elements and relations shown in Figure 8.

Element	Relation	Element
f	defines_var	a
f	defines_var	b
g	calls	f
f	calls	h

Figure 8: Subset of the Elements and Relations

In this example variables "a" and "b" are defined in function "f"; that is, they are local to "f". We can graphically represent this information as shown in Figure 9.




Figure 9: Graphical Representation of Elements and Relations

The local variables are not important during an architecture reconstruction because they provide little insight into the architecture of the system. Therefore, instances of local variables can be aggregated to the functions in which they occur. Two patterns can be written for this purpose. Examples of these types of patterns are shown in Figure 10.

```

#Local Variable aggregation
SELECT tName
  FROM Components
  WHERE tType='Function';
print '$fields[0]+ $fields[0] Function\n';

SELECT d1.func, d1.local_variable
  FROM defines_var d1;
print '$fields[0] $fields[1] Function\n';
  
```

Figure 10: Patterns to Aggregate Local Variables to the Function in Which They Are Defined

The first pattern updates the visual representation in Dali by adding a “+” after each function name, which means that the function is now an aggregate of the function and the local variables defined within it. The SQL query selects functions from the components table. The perl expression, starting with `print...`, is executed for each line of the SQL query results. The `$fields` array is automatically populated with the fields resulting from the query. In this case, only one field is selected (`tName`) from the table, so `$fields[0]` will store the value of this field for each tuple selected. The expression generates lines of the form:

`<function>+ <function> Function`

This line specifies that the element <function> should be aggregated into <function>+, which will have the type Function.

The second pattern hides the local variables from the visualization. The SQL query will identify the local variables for each function defined by selecting each tuple in the `defines_var` table. Thus in the perl expression, `$fields[0]` corresponds to the `func` field and `$fields[1]` corresponds to the `local_variable` field. So the output is of the form

<function>+ <variable> Function

Each local variable for a function is to be added to the <function>+ aggregate for the function. The order of execution of these two patterns is not important because the final results achieved through the application of both queries are sorted.

The result of applying the pattern is represented graphically in Figure 11. Most patterns in Dali are developed in a similar manner.




Figure 11: Result of Applying the Pattern to Aggregate Local Variables

The primary mechanism for manipulating the views is the application of patterns (i.e., inverse mappings). Examples include patterns that

- identify types
- aggregate local variables with functions
- aggregate members with classes
- compose architecture-level elements

An example of a pattern that identifies an architectural level component is shown in Figure 12. This query identifies the `Logical_Interaction` architectural component. The

query says that if the class name is Presentation, Bspline, or Color, or the class is a subclass of Presentation, it belongs in the Logical_Interaction component.

```
SELECT tSubclass
  FROM has_subclass
 WHERE tSuperclass='Presentation';
print ''Logical_Interaction $fields[0]'';

SELECT tName
  FROM components
 WHERE tName='Presentation'
 OR tName='Bspline'
 OR tName='Color';
print ''Logical_Interaction $fields[0]'';
```

Figure 12: Query to Identify the Logical_Interaction Component

Patterns are written in this way to abstract information from the lower level information to generate architecture-level views. The reconstructor builds these patterns to test hypotheses about the system. If a particular pattern does not yield useful results it can be discarded. The reconstructor iterates through this process until useful architectural views have been obtained.

6.1 Guidelines

These guidelines apply to the Architecture Reconstruction phase:

- Be prepared to work with the architect closely and to iterate several times on the architectural abstractions that are created. This is particularly important in cases where the system has no explicit, documented architecture. In such cases, architectural abstractions can be created as hypotheses, and these hypotheses can be tested by creating the views and showing them to the architect and other stakeholders. Based on the false negatives and false positives found, the architect may decide to create new abstractions, resulting in new Dali patterns to apply (or perhaps even new extractions that need to be done).
- When developing patterns, try to build ones that are succinct and do not list every source element. The pattern shown in Figure 12 is an example of a good pattern; an example of a bad pattern is shown in Figure 13. In the bad pattern, the source elements that comprise the component are simply listed, which makes the pattern difficult to use, understand, and reuse.
- Patterns can be based on naming conventions if the naming conventions are used consistently throughout the system. For example, a naming convention could specify that all functions, data, and files that belong to the Interface component be given names that begin with i_.
- Patterns can be based on the directory structure where files and functions are located. Component aggregations can be based on these directories.
- As architecture reconstruction is the effort of redetermining architectural decisions, given only the results of these decisions in the actual artifacts (i.e., the code that implements the

decisions). As the reconstruction process proceeds, information must be added to re-introduce the architectural decisions. This process introduces bias from the reconstructor, thus reinforcing the need for involvement by an architecture expert.

```
SELECT tName
  FROM components
 WHERE tName='vanish-xforms.cc'
 OR tName='PrimitiveOp'
 OR tName='Mapping'
 OR tName='MappingEditor'
 .
 .
 .
 OR tName='InputValue'
 OR tName='Point'
 OR tName='VEC'
 OR tName='MAT'
 OR ((tName ~ 'Dbg$' OR tName ~ 'Event$'
      AND tType='Class');
print ``Dialogue $fields[0]``;
```

Figure 13: Example of a Bad Pattern

7 Other Architecture Reconstruction Approaches

This section explores other approaches for architecture analysis.

7.1 Bowman and Associates

Bowman and associates outline a similar method to that of Dali for extracting architectural documentation from the code of an implemented system [Bowman 99]. In one example, they reconstructed the architecture of the Linux system. They analyzed source code using the cfx program (c-code fact extractor) to obtain symbol information (elements in Dali) from the code and generated a set of relations between the symbols. Then, they manually created a tree-structured decomposition of the Linux system into subsystems and assigned the source files to these subsystems. Next, they used the grok fact manipulator tool to determine relations between the identified subsystems, and the lseedit visualization tool to visualize the extracted system structure. The resulting structure was refined by moving source files between subsystems.

Unlike the approach used in Dali, this one is primarily manual. The reconstructor carries out subsystem and component identification by manually selecting source file elements to belong to these views. Dali is more automated, so queries can be written to carry out these tasks. The first step in Bowman and associates' approach was to develop a conceptual architecture. This step is not part of the phases of using Dali outlined earlier, but developing a conceptual architectural view with the help of the developers, maintainers, or the architecture is certainly part of the overall approach when Dali is used. This conceptual architectural view helps to guide the reconstruction effort in the generation and testing of hypotheses. The visualization using Rigi allows for more interaction by the reconstructor. By selecting a particular component in Dali, the lower level elements that comprise those components become visible, and by selecting a link between two components, the relations represented become visible. Bowman's approach does not appear to provide this level of interaction.

7.2 Harris and Associates

Harris and associates outline a framework for architecture reconstruction using a combined bottom-up and top-down approach [Harris 95]. The framework consists of three components: 1) the architectural representation, 2) the source code recognition engine and supporting library of recognition queries, and 3) a "bird's eye" program overview capability. The bottom-up analysis uses the bird's eye view to display the system's file structure and components and

to reorganize information into more meaningful clusters. The top-down analysis uses particular architectural styles to define components that should be found in the software. Recognition queries are then run to determine if the expected components exist.

Harris's approach is based on a set of implementation language independent queries that are applied to an AST. Parsing the source code of a system generates the AST, which is specific to a particular programming language. The application mechanism of the queries is also specific for each programming language (i.e., AST specific). Thus if a new language needs to be handled, a new AST has to be developed, a parser has to be written, and a new application mechanism has to be derived. This is not the case in Dali. Using Dali, views can be extracted from different languages using the appropriate tools, and the development of queries to generate architectural representations does not depend on any particular programming language. In fact, Dali can be used on code that cannot be parsed. Thus Dali is more easily applicable across a wider set of programming languages. Harris's approach does provide some metrics information about the amount of code covered by particular architectural styles in the system, which may be useful for maintenance and reengineering purposes. For example, if a particular architectural style in the system has to be changed or reimplemented, it is possible to get an idea of how big the problem will be. This type of information is not provided in the Dali workbench.

7.3 Guo and Associates

Guo and associates outline the semi-automatic architecture recovery method (ARM) that assists in architecture recovery for systems that are designed and developed using patterns [Guo 99]. It consists of four major phases: 1) developing a concrete pattern recognition plan, 2) extracting a source model, 3) detecting and evaluating pattern instances, and 4) reconstructing and analyzing the architecture. Case studies have been presented showing the use of the ARM method to reconstruct systems and check the conformance of these systems against their documented architectures. Pattern rules are transformed into pattern queries, which can be applied automatically to detect pattern instances from the source model. Refinement of the pattern queries can help to improve the precision of pattern recognition. Visualizations of the recovered patterns are presented to the tool user and aligned with the designed pattern instances.

Guo and associates used the Dali workbench to perform the architecture recovery work. An abstract pattern rule was then mapped into a concrete pattern rule and converted into an SQL query. This query was then applied to the database to extract instances of the pattern. The Guo method is intended for use on systems that have been developed using design patterns, limiting its applicability. It can only be used with systems that were developed using design patterns or in cases where the design pattern implementations have not eroded over time.

8 Summary

Four major phases of architecture reconstruction were outlined in this report:

- Information Extraction
- Database Construction
- View Fusion
- Architecture Reconstruction

The activities that are carried out to complete these steps were described, and examples of tool support were provided for each activity. Guidelines for carrying out these activities to obtain a satisfactory architecture representation from an existing system were provided. Most of these guidelines are applicable even if other tools are used to support the reconstruction effort and even when a reconstruction is carried out manually.

In our work at the SEI, we have used Dali to support the reconstruction efforts on several systems in a wide variety of domains. One of the reasons Dali has been very useful is because it is language independence. It can be used to analyze information from many different languages and systems and from many different domains. The Dali workbench continues to evolve and be applied on new projects.

References

- [Bowman 99]** Bowman, T.; Holt, R. C.; & Brewster, N. V. "Linux as a Case Study: Its Extracted Software Architecture." 555-563. *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Software Engineering*. Los Angeles, CA, May 16-22, 1999. New York, NY: ACM Press, 1999.
- [Brand 97]** van den Brand, M. G. J.; Sellink, M.; & Verhoef, C. "Generation of Components for Software Renovation Factories From Context-Free Grammars," 144-153. *Proceedings of the Fourth Working Conference on Reverse Engineering*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 6-8, 1997. New York, NY: ACM Press, 1997.
- [Clements 02]** Clements, P.; Kazman, R.; & Klein, M. *Evaluating Software Architectures: Methods and Case Studies*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley, 2002.
- [Guo 99]** Guo, G.; Atlee, J.; & Kazman, R. "A Software Architecture Reconstruction Method," 225-243. *Proceedings of the First Working IFIP Conference on Software Architecture (WICSA1)*. San Antonio, TX, February 22-24, 1999. Norwell, Massachusetts: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999.
- [Harris 95]** Harris, D. R.; Reubenstein, H. B.; & Yeh, A. S. "Reverse Engineering to the Architectural Level." 186-195. *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*. Seattle, WA, April 23-30, 1995. New York, NY: ACM Press, 1995.
- [Kazman 99]** Kazman, R. & Carriere, S. J. "Playing Detective: Reconstructing Software Architecture from Available Evidence." *Journal of Automated Software Engineering* 6, 2 (April 1999): 107-138.
- [Kazman 00]** Kazman, R.; Klein, M.; & Clements, P. *ATAM: Method for Architecture Evaluation* (CMU/SEI-2000-TR-004, ADA382629). Pittsburgh, PA.: Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, 2000. <<http://www.sei.cmu.edu/publications/documents/00.reports/00tr004.html>> (2000).

- [Krikhaar 99] Krikhaar, R. *Software Architecture Reconstruction*, PhD Thesis. University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1999.
- [McCabe 00] McCabe & Associates, Inc. McCabe IQ2 Suite.
<<http://www.mccabe.com>> (Valid as of December 2002).
- [Müller 93] Müller, H. A.; Mehmet, O. A.; Tilley, S. R.; & Uhl, J. S. "A Reverse Engineering Approach to System Identification." *Journal of Software Maintenance: Research and Practice* 5, 4 (December, 1993): 181-204.
- [O'Brien 02] O'Brien, L. Experiences in Architecture Reconstruction at Nokia, (CMU/SEI-2002-TN-004). Pittsburgh, PA: Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, 2000.
<<http://www.sei.cmu.edu/publications/documents/02.reports/02tn004.html>>.
- [Sneed 98] Sneed, H. M. "Architecture and Functions of a Commercial Software Reengineering Workbench." 2-10. *Proceedings of the Second Euromicro Conference on Maintenance and Reengineering*. Florence, Italy, March 8-11, 1998. Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Computer Society Press, 1998.
- [Stonebraker 90] Stonebraker, M.; Rowe, L.; & Hirohama, M. "The Implementation of POSTGRES." *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 2, 1. (March, 1990): 125-141.
- [Wong 94] Wong, K.; Tilley, S.; Müller, H.; & Storey, M. "Programmable Reverse Engineering." *International Journal of Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering* 4, 4 (December 1994): 501-520.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (LEAVE BLANK)		2. REPORT DATE December 2002		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Architecture Reconstruction Guidelines, 2 nd Edition			5. FUNDING NUMBERS F19628-00-C-0003	
6. author(s) Rick Kazman, Liam O'Brien, Chris Verhoef				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Software Engineering Institute Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA 15213			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER CMU/SEI-2002-TR-034	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) HQ ESC/XPK 5 Eglin Street Hanscom AFB, MA 01731-2116			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER ESC-TR-2002-034	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12.A DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Unclassified/Unlimited, DTIC, NTIS			12.B DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (MAXIMUM 200 WORDS) Architecture reconstruction is the process of obtaining the "as-built" architecture of an implemented system from the existing legacy system. For this process, tools are used to extract information about the system that will assist in building successive levels of abstraction. Although generating a useful representation is not always possible, a successful reconstruction results in an architectural representation that aids in reasoning about the system. This recovered representation is most often used as a basis for redocumenting the architecture of an existing system if the documentation is out of date or nonexistent, and can be used to check the "as-built" architecture against the "as-designed" architecture. The architectural representation can also be used as a starting point for reengineering the system to a new desired architecture. Finally, the representation can be used to help identify components for reuse or to help establish a software product line. This report describes the process of architecture reconstruction using the Dali architecture reconstruction workbench. Guidelines are presented for reconstructing the architectural representations of existing systems. Most of these guidelines are not specific to the Dali tool, can be used with other tools, and are useful even if the architecture reconstruction is carried out manually.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS architecture representation, architecture reconstruction, architecture reengineering			NUMBER OF PAGES 42	
16. PRICE CODE				
7. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	